

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 30, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 6-17 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis.

Claim 1 recites "the user interacting with one or more resources through a transaction server to execute the transaction request" and the "resources include one or more systems configured to provide the location of a technician in the field". Neither APA nor Kikinis teaches or suggests these features.

APA was relied upon for disclosing a supervisor interacting with one or more resources. In the APA, the supervisor calls a colleague and the colleague interacts with resources on the supervisor's behalf. Thus, the supervisor in the APA does not interact with the resources through a transaction server. Rather, in the APA a colleague interacts with the resources. The method of claim 1 allows a user to interact with resources without relying on other human interaction. APA fails to teach this type of interaction.

Furthermore, APA fails to teach the resources identified in claim 1. The APA makes generic reference to resources, but fails to identify the resources recited in claim 1, and fails to discuss a transaction server interfacing with the resources.

Kikinis was relied upon for disclosing login request and security checks for users accessing a WAP gateway. Kikinis, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of APA discussed above. Thus, even if APA and Kikinis are combined, the subject matter of

00355  
BLL-0219

10

claim 1 does not result.

For the above reasons claim 1 is patentable over APA in view of Kikinis. Claims 2, 9, 10 and 22 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over APA in view Kikinis for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Claims 7, 8, 11-17 and 19-21 include features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and are patentable over APA in view Kikinis for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claims 2, 6-8 and 21 recite additional resources not taught by APA in view Kikinis.

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and Matsumoto. These claims depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claims 3-5 recite additional resources not taught by APA in view Kikinis and Matsumoto.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and Karlsson. Claim 18 is dependent on claim 16 and is patentable over Applicants' admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Kikinis and Karlsson for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 16.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

00355  
BLL-0219

11

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: October 28, 2004

00355  
BLL-0219

12